

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/449,660 | WICHELMAN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Tom Volper | 2697 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ricky Ngo. (3) Glenn Brown.
 (2) Tom Volper. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 April 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chen et al..


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The prior art was discussed with respect to measuring at one level. It was agreed upon that Chen et al. tests only at one level, but that the measuring device is movable within the network architecture. Thus, it is possible to measure at different levels, but not simultaneously by one device. The language of claims 1 and 13 provides for testing at different levels, but does not explicitly state that test results from multiple levels are available simultaneously from a device positioned at one location. The examiner suggests modifying the claims to provide this distinction from the prior art. .